

REMARKS

The abstract and claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Claims 6-19 have been added. Claims 1-19 are pending in this Application. The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed on March 16, 2004. Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections and objections in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Abstract of the disclosure is objected to because a typographical error in line 6. The Abstract has been amended to capitalize “when” as requested by the Office Action.

The Office Action also stated that the use of a trademarked term “Java”® should be capitalized and accompanied by “the generic terminology”. Applicant has examined the Application and believes that the trademark “Java” has been appropriately capitalized and the first use of the term “Java” on page 1, line 14, has been appropriately marked with a trademark registration symbol. Further, a reference to the trademark owner in question, namely Sun Microsystems, Inc.® on page 1 in the first sentence beneath “Background of the Invention” is also included. Further, each use of the term “Java” is capitalized, thus indicating a name of a product. Accordingly, Applicant has shown both respect for the proprietary nature of the Java mark and made an effort to avoid use which might adversely affect its validity as a trademark. Consequently, Applicant requests withdrawal of all objections to the specification or further clarification as to any action or amendments deemed necessary by the Examiner.

Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for antecedent basis. Claim 1 has been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as claim 2 recites the limitation “said memory referring predetermined data” in line 8. Claim 2 has been amended to recite “said memory”. Claim 1 has been similarly amended to clarify claim 1.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the term “information” in line 4 of claim 3 is indefinite according to the Office Action on page 3, paragraph 8. In particular, the Office Action states that the term “information” is being used contrary to its “accepted meaning”. Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action’s overly narrow interpretation of the term “information”. Merriam-Webster online dictionary at www.merriamwebster.com offers generally one set of meanings for the term “information”, including:

1 : the communication or reception of knowledge or intelligence;
.... (3) : FACTS, DATA b : the attribute inherent in and communicated by one of two or more alternative sequences or arrangements of something (as in ... binary digits in a computer program) that produce specific effects c (1) : a signal or character (as in a communication system or computer) representing data (2) : something (as a message, experimental data, or a picture) which justifies change in a construct (as a plan or theory) that represents physical or mental experience or another construct d : a quantitative measure of the content of information.”

Other dictionaries exist which also provide further definitions, such as the IEEE dictionary, which are broader than the simple definition suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, the use of the term “information” is not narrowly defined as indicated by the Office Action or used inconsistently with other generally understood and known meanings for the term “information”, thus this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 has been rejected for being indefinite with respect to whether or not result data is stored in “head code data” or “link information”, or both. Claim 4 is further rejected for being indefinite with respect to an ambiguity as to whether, if result data is stored in both “head code data” and “link information”, whether “head code data” is

contained within “link information”, or vice versa, or if there is some type of other relationship.

Claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, “ ... said link information provided for linking to said object program contains code data of a number of fixed lengths, and said result data of said resolved reference is stored in a predetermined location in a head code data.” Claim 3 recites, *inter alia*, “said program executing means stores said result data of said resolved reference in a link information”

Claims 3 and 4 recite, *inter alia*, that “said result data” is stored in “a link information” and that “said result data is stored in a predetermined location in a head code data.” Insofar as the Office Action has identified several embodiments of the invention as discussed above, the claims are not ambiguous. However, claim 3 recites that “said result data” is stored in a link information” and claim 4 recites, *inter alia*, that “said result data ... is stored in ... a head code data” Both claim 3 and 4 clearly define, without uncertainty, objective limitations that can be clearly understood by a person skilled in the art. Accordingly, Applicant believes there is no uncertainty as to the claimed device and that the objection to claim 4 should be withdrawn.

Applicant also respectfully traverses the Office Action’s view that the specification at page 10, lines 28-29, limits the meaning of claim 4 to a meaning contained in only one small part of the Application, namely a portion of the “summary of the invention”. The claims should be read in light of the entire specification, including the drawings, and the claims limitations as a whole.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102((b) as being anticipated by Tock (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,718). Reconsideration of all rejections and objections are respectfully requested. Amended claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, “extracting reference data comprising a first and second reference data, said first reference data comprising resolved class related reference data and said second reference data comprising a resolved field related reference data” Tock does not disclose, *inter alia*, “extracting reference

data comprising a first and second reference data ... said first reference data comprising resolved class related reference data and said second reference data comprising a resolved field related reference data” Instead, Tock discloses determining “methods and data that are to be stored in a read only memory and those that are to be stored in a random access memory” (Tock, COL. 6, lines 1-5) in the form of “an offset indicating a memory location [where a] memory storage indicator ... indicates which type of memory storage device a particular set of bytecodes is to reside” (Tock, COL 5, lines 43-48). Accordingly, Tock does not disclose, *inter alia*, “extracting reference data comprising a first and second reference data ... said first reference data comprising resolved class related reference data and said second reference data comprising a resolved field related reference data”

Amended claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, “a means to store result data of a resolved reference linking to said program through a reference data comprising a first and second reference data, at least one of said reference data to specify a location in a memory to be accessed, wherein said first reference data is determined based on class data and said second reference data comprises an index value for one or more field data”

As discussed above, Tock does not disclose, *inter alia*, “a first and second reference data ... wherein said first reference data is determined based on class data and said second reference data comprises an index value for one or more field data” Instead, Tock offline class loader only determines the methods and data that are to be stored in read-only memory (ROM) and random-access memory (RAM). (Tock, COL. 6, lines 1-4) Accordingly, amended claim 2 is allowable over Tock.

Claims 3-19 are also allowable as they depend from claims 1 or 2, and for other reasons. For example, claim 9 recites a “a position index data indicating a relationship of a data element within a table.” Tock’s offline class loader does not store “position index data” as in claim 9. Rather, it stores a memory offset which only indicates ROM or RAM storage. (Tock, COL. 6, lines 1-4)

Application No.: 09/804,244

Docket No.: G5030.0027/P027

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: July 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Gianni Minutoli

Registration No.: 41,198

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP Jeremy A. Cubert

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicants